

which are being changed. The substitute specification includes the same changes as are indicated in the marked-up copy. Applicants' undersigned attorney has reviewed the substitute specification and submits that the substitute specification contains no new matter.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 34-42 and 53-76 are presented for consideration. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 34, 35, 37-42, 61-69 and 73 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 17, 19, 21-24, 26-33 and 43-52 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25 and 34 have been amended to clarify features of the subject invention, while claims 53-76 have been added to recite additional features of the subject invention. Support for these changes and claims can be found in the original application as filed. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 35-52 have been allowed, that claim 34 would be allowable if amended to overcome a minor informality, and that claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 25 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. As discussed below, Applicants have corrected the informality in independent claim 34. Therefore, that claim, as well as new claims 53 and 54 depending therefrom, should be deemed allowable at the outset. In addition, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have rewritten claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 25 in independent form. Therefore, these claims likewise should be deemed allowable at the outset. Also, new claims 55-60 variously depend from allowed independent claims 35, 41 and 42. Therefore, those claims likewise should be deemed allowable at the outset.

In addition to the foregoing claims being allowable, Applicants submit that claims 61-76 patentably define features of the subject invention.

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 17, 19, 21-24, 26-28, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by either U.S. Patent No. 6,426,790 to Hayashi or U.S. Patent No. 6,184,972 to Mizutani et al. Applicants submit that these patents do not teach many features of the present invention, as previously recited in those claims. Therefore, these rejections are respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, these claims having been canceled, Applicants submit that the noted rejections have become moot and should be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants submit that new claims 61-76 patentably define features of the exposure apparatus, device manufacturing method, conveying system and substrate holding of the present invention.

Notably, independent claims 61-64 are directed to various aspects of exposure apparatus, and each includes features of the substrate attracting and holding system along the lines recited in allowable independent claims 15, 16, 18 and 20, respectively. Similarly, independent claims 65-68 are directed to various aspects of device manufacturing methods, and each recites various aspects of the substrate attracting and holding system as recited in allowable independent claims 15, 16, 18 and 20, respectively. Applicants submit, therefore, that independent claims 61-68 likewise patentably define features of the subject invention.

Further, independent claims 69 recites a conveying system having a cassette for accommodating therein a plurality of chucks being different with respect to disposition of protrusions for supporting a substrate, a conveyance robot for conveying an arbitrary chuck, selected out of the plurality of chucks accommodated in the cassette, on the basis of information related to a processing region on the substrate and a stage for holding the arbitrary chuck conveyed by the conveyance robot and for supporting the substrate with use of protrusions provided on the arbitrary chuck.

Still further, independent claim 73 recites a substrate holding system that includes a holding table for holding a substrate, a protrusion provided on the holding table, the protrusion having a constant relative position with respect to a plurality of alignment marks formed on the substrate, or to a plurality of alignment marks to be produced on the substrate.

Applicants submit that the cited art does not teach or suggest such features of the present invention, as recited in independent claims 69 and 73.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the present invention, as recited in independent claims 61-69 and 73, also is patentably defined over the cited art.

Dependent claims 70-72 and 74-76 also should be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Further individual consideration of these dependent claims is requested.

Applicants further submit that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places this application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the application in condition

for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment, as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is requested under 37 CFR 1.116.

Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are also requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven E. Warner", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants

Steven E. Warner

Registration No. 33,326

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SEW/eab

DC_MAIN 122829 v 1